

REMARKS**Introductory Comments:**

The Advisory Action dated October 4, 2005, was carefully reviewed. It is respectfully requested the Examiner reconsider the present application in light of the Request for Continued Examination, the above amendments and the remarks herein.

In the Final Office Action dated September 19, 2005, claims 1, 5-7 and 9-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Powell et al. [US 2002/0073167] in view of Marks et al. (USPN 6,463,447). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Powell et al. and Marks et al in view of Brendel et al. (USPN 5,774,660). Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, and 9 are cancelled. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 10-17.

In Response To The Claim Objections:

Claim 3 was objected to because of the following informalities: claim 3 is dependent on cancelled claim 2. Appropriate correction was required. The Applicants respond by amending claim 3 as suggested to depend on claim 1.

In Response To The 112 Rejection:

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 3 recites the limitation "said group

of user terminals" in line 2 of the claim. In response to this rejection, the Applicants amend claim 3 to include "said client group of computers", which is properly referenced in claim 1.

In Response To The 103 Rejections:

Claims 1, 5-7 and 9-17 were rejected because, according to the Office Action, Powell teaches a server load reduction system including a master URL containing data comprising: a proxy server comprising a proxy server cache and a distribution mechanism, said proxy server adapted to receive the data from the master URL, said proxy server comprising logic operative to record the data in a proxy server cache, said proxy server further comprising a distribution mechanism for automatically distributing the data to a client group of computers when said proxy server contains all of the data [paragraphs 0011, 0016, 0030-0033, 0100, 0134 and 0177]; a multicast server (not explicitly stated) loading the data in response to notification by said proxy server to load the data when said proxy server contains all of the data [paragraph 0012, 0063, 0153-01551; a multicast server client storage location comprising a browser cache receiving the data from said multicast server and storing the data in said browser cache for access by said group of computer users [paragraphs 0047, 0051, 0063]; and a proxy browser adapted to conduct a browse operation to request the data contained in the master URL, said browse operation conducted through said proxy server, said proxy browser containing logic operative to notify said multicast server to load the data to said client group of computers when said proxy server

contains all of the data and when said client group of computers have received a command from the proxy browser to load the data [paragraphs 0011, 0016, 0030-0033,0061-0063,0134]. The Office Action recognizes that Powell et al. fail to explicitly teach a multicast server.

According to the Office Action, Marks et al. disclose a network operations center comprising a middleware server, a master proxy server and multicast server in communication with the web cache, data storage and local server (col. 6 line 22-col. 7 line 46, col. 13 line 64-col. 14 Line 20, col. 15 line 65-col. 16 line 15, col. 18 lines 11-28, col. 18 line 57-cot. 19 line 7 and col. 20 line 23-col. 21 line 4).

Although the Applicants believe the claims to be allowable in their current form, the Applicants nevertheless amend claims 1, 7, and 11 to include: a client group of computers comprising a plurality of browsers receiving the master URL to browse to only when the data representing a target page has been completely distributed to the client group of computers, in accordance with paragraphs [0015] and [0021]; a multicast server client storage location comprising a client browser cache and comprising logic automatically distributing the data to the client group of computers via multicast file distribution, in accordance with paragraphs [0021] and [0029]; and a client server for determining that a potential URL is the desired master URL and loading the master URL to the multicast server client storage location, in accordance with paragraphs [0020] and [0029].

Claims 1, 7, and 11 are new and nonobvious because they include elements not disclosed or suggested by the prior art. Claims 1, 7, and 11 include a distribution mechanism such that a plurality of client computer browsers receive the master URL to browse to when the data representing a target page has been completely distributed to the client group of computers. Although Powell arguably transmits data to servers, it does not disclose or suggest that a plurality of client computers receive master URL data such that when, for example, an instructor indicates that the clients operating the client group of computers should load a particular URL, the clients find the information already loaded the plurality of client computers.

Claims 1, 7, and 11 further include a multicast server client storage location including a client browser cache and comprising logic automatically distributing the data to the client group of computers via multicast file distribution. As discussed earlier, Powell mentions multicast signals (without disclosing or suggesting a multicast server client storage location), however, these signals are used for satellite transmissions as opposed to a local transmission from a local multicast server to a plurality of clients. It is well known that satellites typically broadcast in multicast, however, there is no reason why one skilled in the art would use multicast signals in the way claimed by the Applicants. The claims define a system such that the multicast server may rapidly load data from the proxy server and, through multicast signals, rapidly transmit the information to a

multicast server client storage. This is particularly useful for interactive teaching and presentations as the signals are rapidly multicast from a multicast client storage to the group of users.

Instead, Powell is directed to a system wherein users download data on demand through a proxy system. Although this type of system would be useful for satellite communications and transmissions, it would not serve the needs of interactive teaching in a classroom setting, as would the present invention.

Marks also does not include a distribution mechanism such that a plurality of client computer browsers receive the master URL to browse to when the data representing a target page has been completely distributed to the client group of computers. Instead, Marks includes a typical bandwidth optimization system, which classifies filters out unwanted signals. (Abstract.) Therefore, each element of the claims is not disclosed or suggested in the prior art.

Because each and every element of claims 1, 7, and 11 are not disclosed or suggested in Powell and Marks, either alone or in combination, claims 1, 7, and 11 are believed to be allowable. Claims 3, 5, 10, and 12-17 depend from claims 1, 7, and 11 and are also believed to be allowable for at least the aforementioned reasons.

Conclusions:

It is respectfully asserted that the amendments to the claims are fully supported by the specification and place the claims into better condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner have any further questions or comments, please contact the undersigned. Please charge any fees required in the filing of this amendment to deposit account 50-0476.

Respectfully submitted,

Artz & Artz

By: 

Justin H. Purcell
Reg. No. 53,493
28333 Telegraph Road
Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 223-9500

Dated: December 19, 2005